

Comments – 2008 Triennial Review

S.S. is Steve Saiz, Central Coast Waterboard

L.M. is Lisa McCann, Central Coast Waterboard

A.S. is Angela Schroter, Central Coast Waterboard

K.W. is Karen Worcester, Central Coast Waterboard

C.R. is Chris Rose, Central Coast Waterboard

Dan Berman NEP

- Interrelation between what Basin Plan says (action by the RB) vs actions taken by the State Board. For example adopting an *E. coli* objective for REC1 – Can State Board adopt the objective for use Statewide - **S.S.** “Yes and Regional Boards can choose to use an additional objective that is more protective. The State Board is already working on the *E. coli* objective so we want to be careful not to duplicate any effort.” Since EPA Adopted an *E.coli* criteria for Water Contact Recreation in 1986 why is it taking State Board so long to adopt this number?
- Concern that his organization is currently collecting *E. coli* data but is does not directly translate to a Basin Plan Objective (anything enforceable). Concern that adopting an objective at the State Level will take longer than adopting an objective at a Regional Level. Also which methods will be acceptable for use (i.e. IDEXX)?
- How do you actually implement these issues in the Basin Plan? It is not immediately obvious what regulatory power the RB has to implements theses amendments. For example how will we regulate cities and counties in land use planning? **S.S.** What we are doing is gathering public interest in these issues – is the worthy of us perusing to make a Basin Plan Objective? **L.M.** We have the authority to issue a permit and require minimization of the impact of any give activity with identifiable discharges that impacts Water Quality.
- Is the potential thru the Basin Planning process for trying to create a different kind of permitting structure or a new kind of regulatory authority or planning to use the existing tools? **L.M.** We are leaving the question open and plan to question that as well.
- Can we create a new process for regulation thru the Basin plan? **L.M.** Not directly. But say we establish a new beneficial use for Natural Hydrologic Conditions and set water quality objectives (i.e. a level of impervious surfaces) and then we could issue a new kind of permit that incorporates this new basin plan objective. **A.S.** – The Basin Plan memorializes intentions and is a tool for both staff and for the public. **L. M.**
- How much attention is the Vision Process gaining? Is this process unique to this Region? **L.M.** unique to us.

- Is the R3 Vision being well received or is the confusion? **L.M.** Little of both. **S.S.** State Board is doing something similar called the strategic plan. Once approved by State Board it goes to the Office of Admin Law for approval.
- Re: prioritization – looking at the list from last time and about 1/3 were completed, and all the new issues proposed look changeling. Do you have an estimate of the effort required and our ability to accomplish these issues. **S.S.** We will estimate staff time required when we finalize a list.
- When is the opportunity for public to comment on the prioritization of the issues once it is finalized? **S.S.** is will be available for public comment when the Staff Report comes out for the July 10th Board Meeting (the Staff Report will be released June 30th).
- Is the Board Meeting the appropriate place to voice my opinion about dedicating more resources to the issues identified and completing more of these issues within the next 3 years. **L.M.** Staff will also prepare info for the Board info that shows what can be completed with assigned resources. At the level of resources that is dedicated, here is what we can commit to but if we had additional resources we could also commit to completing these additional items.

Ellen Pritchett - City of Santa Maria

- Will this require any duplication of effort on the part of municipalities in light of they requirement to address hydromod in the stormwater mgmt plans. Is this dove-tailing into that effort? Concern that it will require extra effort? **L.M.** yes it is dove-tailing into the effort. We plan to expand on that effort but it is defiantly aligned
- Issue 7 & 15 is there a difference in the two issues? **S.S.** – Issue 7 is specific to BP standards (i.e. TDS, salinity) and says that those numeric standards should be expanded to ALL groundwaters. Issue 15 is a new proposed to address the issue of GW recharge and ensure adequate recharge (both quantity – protecting infiltration per yield and water quality)
- The Cities Primary concern is with the listings on the 303(d) list is based on the BU assigned to the waterbodies. Concern for the beneficial uses established for the River and the three flood control channels that run thru the city. What is the process for changing the beneficial uses assigned to these waters. The flood control channels are constructed purely for flood control. They do not have BU's specifically designated and as a result they are assigned default BU's. **S.S.** Chapter 2 of Basin Plan defines how waters are assigned default BU's. In order to changes these beneficial uses the CWA has a process for de-designation of Beneficial Uses. **L. M.** Please submit a letter to use listing all beneficial uses you

feel are inappropriately designated and should be re-evaluated.

- Why is there farming allowed in the river bed when it is an impaired waterbody? Especially when there is discharge from the farms.
- Why is the flood control system is not incorporated into the SB County Maintenance plan (annual document). It is an appendix in the plan but it is not addressed. Shouldn't the County also be addressing the issue of farming in the River!
- Will the city be held responsible for uses that they do not control like Agriculture and groundwater loading?

Comments/questions from Mary Adams

Why are we de-designating Shellfish from Salinas, San Lorenzo and Soquel?

Historically they are shellfish habitat – it is because of pollution that they no longer support it.

Issue 15 – I would be so stoked if we had a nitrate numeric objective for all waters designated as GW recharge. Same as the MUN objective!

Issue 17 – Develop numeric objectives for Turbidity and Toxicity. I suggest we make these specific to the Beneficial Uses (in addition to a general objective). For example the number for turbidity should be much lower to protect from aquatic life than to protect from sedimentation.